

1
2
3
4
5
6 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
7 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

8 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)

9 Plaintiff,)

10 v.)

11 JAMES ROBINSON,)

12 Defendant.)
13 _____)

2:95-CR-58-RCJ-1

ORDER

14
15 Currently before the Court are six motions: a motion to vacate under 28 U.S.C. § 2255
16 (Doc. (#490)), three motions to appoint counsel (Docs. (##491, 492, 495)), an unsigned letter
17 requesting documents (Doc. (#493)), and an unsigned request for an evidentiary hearing (Doc.
18 (#496)). For the reasons discussed herein, the motions are denied.

19 **BACKGROUND**

20 In August, 1995, a jury convicted Petitioner James Robinson for the felonies of (1)
21 unlawful use of a communications facility and (2) attempting to possess cocaine with the intent
22 to distribute. (See Doc. (#458) at 2). He was sentenced to 262 months in federal prison.
23 (See *id.*) The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals upheld his convictions on direct appeal in
24 October, 1997. (See *id.*)

25 At some point before 2002,¹ Petitioner filed a motion for relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2255.
26 (See Doc. (#374) at 3). Petitioner supplemented this motion, but the Ninth Circuit ultimately
27
28

¹ The record is unclear on when Petitioner filed his first § 2255 motion. Petitioner filed it after his direct appeal in October, 1997, but before his successive motions, which were decided in 2002 (Doc. (#345)).

1 denied it. (See *id.*) Both this Court and the Ninth Circuit declined to issue a Certificate of
2 Appealability. (Docs. (##184, 207); see Doc. (#374) at 3).

3 Since being denied a Certificate of Appealability, Petitioner has continuously filed more
4 letters and motions that fall under the jurisdiction of § 2255. (See Doc. (# 374) at 3). The
5 Ninth Circuit reviewed and denied on the merits at least five applications for authorization to
6 file successive § 2255 motions. (See Docs. ## 380, 383, 426, 436, 446, 487 (voluntarily
7 dismissed by Petitioner)).

8 Before 2002, Petitioner filed at least five successive motions to vacate. (See Doc.
9 (#374) at 3). In 2008, Petitioner also filed multiple motions for an appointment of counsel
10 (Docs. (# 408, 409, 410, 412)), and motions for an evidentiary hearing (Docs. (##408, 409,
11 412)). The Court denied these motions. (Docs. (## 374, 418)).

12 On August 25, 2008, the Court granted Petitioner's motion to reduce his sentence from
13 262 months to 210 months due to a new sentencing law passed after Petitioner was convicted.
14 (Doc. (#406)). On August 6, 2010, he was released from prison, but subject to six years of
15 supervised release. (See Doc. (#484) at 2). However, on February 12, 2011, Petitioner was
16 arrested for violating the terms of his supervised release. (See Doc. (#465)). The Court
17 revoked his supervised release, and sentenced Petitioner to ten months in prison without
18 additional supervised release. (Doc. (#481) at 2-3). Petitioner was released from prison on
19 December 14, 2011.²

20 LEGAL STANDARD

21 A district judge may not entertain an application for a writ of habeas corpus to evaluate
22 the detention of a federal prisoner except by 28 U.S.C. § 2255. 28 U.S.C. § 2244(a). Section
23 2255 only applies to prisoners "in custody under sentence of a court established by Act of
24 Congress." 28 U.S.C. § 2255(a). A person is in custody of the United States if his or her
25 movements "are restrained by authority of the United States" *Jones v. Cunningham*, 371

26
27 ² Inmate Locator, Federal Bureau of Prisons,
28 [http://www.bop.gov/iloc2/InmateFinderServlet
?Transaction=IDSearch&needingMoreList=false&IDType=IRN&IDNumber=30289-
048&x=78&y=16](http://www.bop.gov/iloc2/InmateFinderServlet?Transaction=IDSearch&needingMoreList=false&IDType=IRN&IDNumber=30289-048&x=78&y=16).

1 U.S. 236, 240 (1963) (internal quotations omitted). If the petitioner is released from custody
2 of the respondent, the petition becomes moot. See *id.* at 241.

3 DISCUSSION

4 Petitioner asks the Court to vacate his sentence on four grounds: (1) the government
5 violated his constitutional rights by withholding evidence, (2) *Brady*³ violation by the United
6 States Attorney's office, (3) the lead investigator fabricated evidence that led to Petitioner's
7 arrest, and (4) prosecutorial misconduct by allowing "perjury testimony." (Doc. (#490) at 6-9)
8 (emphasis in original).

9 Petitioner is no longer in the custody of the United States, nor is he under supervised
10 release or otherwise restrained by the United States. Therefore, his § 2255 motion to vacate
11 (#490) is denied as moot. The Court also denies as moot Petitioner's motion for an
12 evidentiary hearing (#496), motions for appointment of counsel (## 491, 492, 495) and motion
13 for copies of documents (#493).

14 ///

15 ///

16 ///

17 ///

18 ///

19 ///

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27
28 ³ *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83, 87 (1963).

1 **CONCLUSION**


2 For the foregoing reasons, IT IS ORDERED that Petitioner's Motion to Vacate (#490)
3 is DENIED as moot.

4 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Motions for Appointment of Counsel (## 491, 492,
5 495) are DENIED as moot.

6 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Motion for Copies of Documents (#493) is
7 DENIED as moot.

8 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Motion for an Evidentiary Hearing (#496) is
9 DENIED as moot.

10
11 DATED: This 3rd day of August, 2012.

12
13 
14 United States District Judge
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28